

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Applicant would also like to thank the Examiner for the time provided to this application. The application has been carefully amended to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

By the present amendment, claims 1-12 are amended. As such, it is now respectfully submitted that each of the claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 is objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 has now been amended for consistency to recite "a handle." Claims 2-12 are objected to due to informalities in that the claims each refer to a "Handle" in line 1 of the claims. Each of the claims has been amended to recite "The handle" in line 1 of each claim. Each of the claims has been amended for consistency to also recite "the handle," as opposed to using multiple different terms to refer to the handle. In light of the amendments, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 is objected to. As stated with regards to the drawings, Applicant believes that the amendment to FIG. 4 should be entered because the specification fully supports a handle bar with two handles. Attention is directed to page 3, lines 5-7, stating that "the blower tube is either provided with one single handle or a handle bar comprising two handles," (emphasis added). Thus, claim 7 is supported by the drawings and the specification and it is respectfully requested that the objection of claim 7 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 is objected to due to the limitation of "the curved arm." The word "curved" has now been deleted as suggested. In light of the amendment, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite be withdrawn. Claim 7 now recites: "The handle according to claim 1, characterised in that the blower tube (13) is provided with one handle bar comprising two handles the handle on one side of the blower tube and a second handle on an opposite side of the blower tube." This amended claim properly further defines claim 1, which claims a blower and is supported by the specification on page 3, lines 5-7 and the

drawings. It is respectfully requested that the amended claim 7 now receive proper consideration from the Examiner and is now in condition for allowance.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Takahashi (U.S. Patent No. 5,083,340) be withdrawn. It is respectfully suggested that the Takahashi reference does not teach or suggest each of the elements recited in the amended claims. Claim 1 recites that "the handle (10) is placed on an arm (21) that extends in a substantially perpendicular direction from the blower tube; further characterized in that a projection of a longitudinal axis (A) of the handle (20) is placed outside the circumference of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13) when seen in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13)."

Takahashi does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 1. For example, Takahashi does not disclose or suggest a handle placed on an arm that extends in a perpendicular direction from the blower tube. Even if the portion between the grip 13 and the connection 11 is considered to be an arm or even if the portion between 7 and 8 is considered to be the arm, these sections still do not "extend in a substantially perpendicular direction from the blower tube... [where] a projection of a longitudinal axis (A) of the handle (20) is placed outside the circumference of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13) when seen in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13)," as recited in claim 1. For example, even if it is believed that a portion of the handle of Takahashi extends in a perpendicular direction, none of the portions include a projection of a longitudinal axis placed outside the circumference of the blower tube when seen in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the blower tube. The amended claim language of "a projection of a longitudinal axis" is provided to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. In the drawing provided on page 7 of the Office action, it is appreciated that the projection of the longitudinal axis A of the handle will intersect with the longitudinal axis of the blower tube. Moreover, the view of the drawing on page 7 of the Office action is not in conformity with the claim language of "when seen in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of... the blower tube." Accordingly, FIG. 2 of the Takahashi reference is the proper view that is consistent with this claim language. Even if the handle position of page 7 of the Office action was used in the view of FIG. 2, the projection of

the longitudinal axis of the handle will still intersect with the longitudinal axis of the blower tube.

On page 10 of the Office action, it is stated that "the handle does not cross the circumference of the blower tube. Therefore, the longitudinal axis of the handle is clearly outside of the circumference of the blower tube." Applicant respectfully disagrees with this statement, as the axis is on a line that continues onwards and will then intersect the circumference of the blower tube. Moreover, claim 1 is now currently amended to recite that "a projection of a longitudinal axis (a) of the handle is placed outside the circumference of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13) when seen in a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13)." Accordingly, Takahashi does not recite each and every limitation of the amended claim 1.

In addition, Takahashi does not disclose or suggest that "that the projection of the longitudinal axis (A) of the handle (20) in said plane is parallel to a straight line (L) extending through the geometrical centre of the cross section of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13) when seen in the plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the stiff section (15) of the blower tube (13)." This amended claim limitation is provided to more clearly define the claimed subject matter. The projection of the longitudinal axis (A) of the handle of Takahashi is not parallel "no matter how the handle is positioned or oriented." In fact, the drawing on page 7 of the Office action includes a longitudinal axis that will intersect, as opposed to being parallel, with a straight line through the cross section of the tube when viewed from a plane perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the blower tube. The drawing on page 7 of the Office action is not from the correct view for the analysis of this claim, as made clear by the amendment of claim 1.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. ABE1-38474.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:



Ronald M. Kachmarik, Reg. No. 59,429

1801 East 9th Street
Ste. 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
216-579-1700

Date: September 22, 2008